Commissioner for Patents United States Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

EDWARD A. GORDON ROPES & GRAY, L.L.P. ONE INTERNATIONAL PLACE

BOSTON, MA 02110-2624

In re Application of: Anwar Application No. 09/835,679 Filed: April 16, 2001 For: SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR DIGITAL DOCUMENT PROCESSING

MAILED

AUG 2 4 2004

Technology Center 2100

DECISION ON PETITION TO MAKE SPECIAL (ACCELERATED EXAMINATION) UNDER M.P.E.P. §708.02 (VIII)

This is a response to the petition filed July 7, 2004, under 37 C.F.R. §1.102(d) and M.P.E.P. \$708.02 (VIII): Accelerated Examination, to make the above-identified application special.

The Petition is **DISMISSED**.

M.P.E.P. § 708.02, Section VIII which sets out the prerequisites for a grantable petition for Accelerated Examination under 37 C.F.R. §1.102(d) states in relevant part:

A new application (one which has not received any examination by the examiner) may be granted special status provided that applicant (and this term includes applicant's attorney or agent) complies with each of the following items:

- Submits a petition to make special accompanied by the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(h); (a)
- Presents all claims directed to a single invention, or if the Office determines that all the claims presented are not obviously directed to a single invention, will make an election without traverse as a prerequisite to the grant of special status;
- Submits a statement(s) that a pre-examination search was made, listing the field of search by class and subclass, publication, Chemical Abstracts, foreign patents, etc. The pre-examination search must be directed to the invention as claimed in the application for which special status is requested. A search made by a foreign patent office satisfies this requirement;

- (d) Submits one copy each of the references deemed most closely related to the subject matter encompassed by the claims if said references are not already of record; and
- (e) Submits a detailed discussion of the references, which discussion points out, with the particularity required by 37 CFR 1.111 (b) and (c), how the claimed subject matter is patentable over the references.

The petition filed July 7, 2004 fails to adequately meet requirements (b), (d) and (e) of the criteria set forth above. With respect to requirement (b), the petition lacks the required statement. With respect to requirement (d), the petition fails to identify which reference(s) is/are considered to be the most closely related to the (claimed) subject matter. Finally and with respect to requirement (e), a detailed discussion of the (aforementioned most closely related) references has not been provided, therefore the petition lacks a detailed discussion with the specificity required under 37 CFR 1.111 (b) and (c). Note, a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references does not comply with the requirements of this section. The petition must specifically point out how the claimed subjected matter is patentable over the cited references.

In addition, and with respect to requirement (e) above, petitioner should ensure that the above discussion is directed to how the language of *each of* the independent claims is specifically distinguishable and patentable from the references provided in requirement (d) above.

Petition to Make Special **DISMISSED**.

Petitioner is given one opportunity to perfect the petition. Any request for reconsideration must be filed within TWO MONTHS of the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are permitted by a declaration or statement providing the information as outlined above.

Until the renewed petition is submitted, the application will be returned to the examiner's docket to await treatment on the merits in the normal order of examination.

Brian L. Johnson

Special Program Examiner

Technology Center 2100

Computer Architecture, Software and Information Security

703-308-0885

BLJ: 8/20/04